



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,404	02/27/2004	Anthony George Burns	1578.117 (11713-US-PAT)	5235
44298	7590	10/06/2008	EXAMINER	
DOCKET CLERK PO BOX 12608 DALLAS, TX 75225			SHU, HO T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2457	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/789,404

Applicant(s)

BURNS, ANTHONY GEORGE

Examiner

HO SHIU

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 21-25 have been cancelled by Applicant's amendment filed on 06/17/2008.

Claim Objections

2. With respect to claim 3, the phrase "logical consistencies" (line 3 of claim 3) is objected to since in the specification (page 17, lines 24) supports "logically inconsistent". Logical consistencies was not supported anywhere in the original specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 7, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lynch et al. (US Pub # US 2002/0111972 A1, hereinafter Lynch) .**

5. With respect to claim 1, Lynch discloses in a communication network having at least a mobile node and a home, the home node having a configured desktop manager, a system for reconfiguring the home-node desktop manager from the mobile

node, said system comprising ([0010], lines 1-10): a configuration status request message generator selectably coupled to the communication network and configured for selectably generating status summary requests for transmission to the home node in order to determine the current configuration of the desktop manager ([0042], lines 1-23); a reconfiguration message generator selectably coupled to the communication network for generating a reconfiguration message for reconfiguring the desktop manager, regardless of whether a configuration status summary request message has been generated ([0012], lines 1-10, [0015], lines 1-13, [0079], lines 1-8, [0081], [0082]); and a home-node reconfiguration message generator selectively coupled to the desktop manager and selectively coupled to the communication network, the home-node reconfiguration message processor arranged to determine whether changes identified in the reconfiguration message are logically inconsistent with the current desktop settings, and to change the desktop configuration according to the reconfiguration message when it is received from the mobile node ([0010], lines 1-10, [0060], lines 1-26).

6. With respect to claim 7, Lynch discloses wherein the communication network is a cellular communication network ([0010], lines 1-10, [0059], lines 1-6).

7. With respect to claim 11, Lynch discloses comprising a reconfiguration server coupled to the communication network, and wherein reconfiguration message generator is resident in the reconfiguration server ([0041], lines 1-12, [0061], lines 1-23)

8. With respect to claim 12, Lynch discloses wherein the mobile node comprises a Web browser and wherein the reconfiguration server includes at least one Web page for transmitting to the mobile node ([0059], lines 1-6, [0061], lines 1-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 2-6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Bucknell et al. (Pub # US 2001/0014603 A1, hereinafter Bucknell)**

11. With respect to claim 2, Lynch does not clearly disclose comprising the home-node message generator for generating reconfiguration confirmation messages for transmitting to the mobile node.

In the same field of endeavor, Bucknell discloses comprising the home-node message generator for generating reconfiguration confirmation messages for transmitting to the mobile node (paragraph 0006, lines 3-5, lines 9-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch with the teachings of Bucknell in order to fully execute the reconfiguration before using the reconfigured settings.

12. With respect to claim 3, Lynch discloses wherein the home-node reconfiguration processor is operable to determine, if logical consistencies have been identified, if the requested configuration changes can be made ([0042], lines 1-23).

13. With respect to claim 4, Lynch discloses wherein the home-node message generator is operable to generate a message for transmission to the mobile station indicating that the changes request in the reconfiguration message can be made ([0042], lines 1-23)

14. With respect to claim 5, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. In addition, Bucknell discloses wherein the reconfiguration messages contain a configuration status summary ([0029], lines 25-30).

15. With respect to claim 6, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. In addition, Bucknell discloses comprising a configuration status summary generator for generating a configuration status summary ([0029], lines 25-30).

16. With respect to claim 9, Lynch does not clearly disclose wherein the reconfiguration message generator is resident in the mobile node.

In the same field of endeavor, Bucknell discloses wherein the reconfiguration message generator is resident in the mobile node ([0012], lines 1-5, [0020], lines 4-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch with the teachings of Bucknell in order to efficiently make use of the possibilities a user may want to interact of what devices they want to reconfigure.

17. **Claims 13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Kaplan et al. (US Patent # 7,043,263 B2, hereinafter Kaplan)**

18. With respect to claim 13, Lynch discloses providing a mobile node operable to communicate in the communication network ([0010], line 1-10), generating a reconfiguration message for reconfiguring the desktop manager ([0042], lines 1-23); transmitting the reconfiguration message to the home node via the communication network ([0060], lines 1-26); determining at the home node whether changes identified in the reconfiguration message are logically inconsistent with the current desktop settings ([0010], lines 1-10, [0060], lines 1-26); and selectively performing the reconfiguration requested in the reconfiguration message ([0010], lines 1-10, [0060], lines 1-26).

However, Lynch does not clearly disclose the mobile node comprising a memory device operable to store a current configuration status summary included in a confirmation message, if any, from the home node subsequent to a reconfiguration; transmitting to the mobile node a configuration status message only if a configuration status summary request message has been received.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the mobile node comprising a memory device operable to store a current configuration status summary included in a confirmation message, if any, from the home node subsequent to a reconfiguration (col. 5, lines 58-61, col. 6, lines 1-6, lines 16-19); transmitting to the mobile node a configuration status message only if a configuration status summary request message has been received (col. 6, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch with the teachings of Kaplan in order to know the current status of the device to accurately configure for selected features by another mobile or from a remote computer (col. 3, lines 41-46).

19. With respect to claim 15, Lynch discloses further comprising the step of requesting a desktop configuration status summary ([0060], lines 1-26).

20. With respect to claim 16, Lynch discloses further comprising the step of receiving the desktop configuration status summary, wherein the step of generating a reconfiguration message is not performed until the desktop configuration status

summary is received ([0060], lines 1-26).

21. With respect to claim 17, Lynch discloses wherein the reconfiguration message is generated in the mobile node ([0010], lines 1-10).

22. **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Friend et al. (US Patent # 7,243,163 B1, hereinafter Friend)**

23. With respect to claim 8, Bucknell does not clearly disclose wherein the desktop manager is password protected and wherein the home-node reconfiguration message processor is operable to determine if a reconfiguration message includes the password.

In the same field of endeavor, Friend clearly discloses a unique encryption key may initially be installed on the wireless device to encrypt communication (column 19, line 67, column 20, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that encrypting a key in a communication device is needed to secure potential unwanted users accessing information which is not for public use/knowledge.

24. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Bucknell as applied to claims 1 and 9 and in further view of**

Friend.

25. With respect to claim 10, Lynch and Bucknell discloses the claimed invention except wherein the mobile node includes an organizer database may be synchronized with a home-node organizer database over the communication network, and wherein the reconfiguration message is transmitted with the organizer synchronization data.

In the same field of endeavor, Friend clearly discloses that not only are messages synchronized, but the entire state of the service may be synchronized which may include the creation of new folders, deletion of old folders, filing of messages to folder, reading a message from the device, etc. (column 19, lines 53-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch and Bucknell with the teachings of Friend since synchronizing a mobile database with the home database is essential such that all information along with programs are kept up-to-date so communication between the databases will have a minimal error while performing any type of task in conjunction with each other.

26. **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Kaplan as applied to claim 13 and in further view of Bucknell.**

27. With respect to claim 14, Lynch and Kaplan discloses the claimed invention except comprising the step of receiving a confirmation message indicating that the requested reconfiguration has been made.

In the same field of endeavor, Bucknell discloses comprising the step of receiving a confirmation message indicating that the requested reconfiguration has been made ([0026], lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch and Kaplan with the teachings of Bucknell in order to fully execute the reconfiguration before using the reconfigured settings.

28. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Kaplan as applied to claims 13 and 17 and in further view of Friend.

29. With respect to claim 18, Lynch and Kaplan discloses the claimed invention except wherein the mobile node includes an organizer database may be synchronized with a home-node organizer database over the communication network, and wherein the reconfiguration message is transmitted with the organizer synchronization data.

In the same field of endeavor, Friend clearly discloses that not only are messages synchronized, but the entire state of the service may be synchronized which

may include the creation of new folders, deletion of old folders, filing of messages to folder, reading a message from the device, etc. (column 19, lines 53-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch and Kaplan with the teachings of Friend since synchronizing a mobile database with the home database is essential such that all information along with programs are kept up-to-date so communication between the databases will have a minimal error while performing any type of task in conjunction with each other.

30. Claims 19-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch in view of Kaplan as applied to claims 13 and in further view of Zirnstein (US Patent # 7,127,491 B2, hereinafter Zirnstein).

31. With respect to claim 19, Lynch discloses requesting a Web page from a Web site on a server via the communication network ([0044], line 1-8); receiving the Web page ([0045], lines 1-9; displaying at least a portion of the Web page; ([0045], lines 1-9); and transmitting the indicated changes to the server ([0044], lines 1-8).

However, Lynch and Kaplan does not clearly disclose interacting with the displayed portion of the Web page to indicate changes to the home-node desktop manager.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirnstein clearly discloses if the extracted command is instead a request for a web page, then command server module selects a

function call to the web browser program module to retrieve the web page corresponding to the web address provided in the extracted command while the output data in such would consist of the web page content (column 10, lines 5-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lynch and Kaplan with the teachings of Zirnstein since a webpage would be incorporated into the device to execute commands on the home node without having to install any additional program/software.

32. With respect to claim 20, Lynch discloses wherein the reconfiguration message is generated in the server.

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS
09/30/2008

Ho Ting Shiu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

/Ario Etienne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157